DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 274 083 EA 018 847

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | The Role of the Principal in Effective Schools. What Research Says About Series, Number 4. Data-Search Reports. |
| INSTITUTION | National Education Association, Washington, D.C. Research Div. |
| PUB DATE | Jun 86 |
| NOTE | 19p. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | Publication Sales, NEA Professional Library, P.O. Box 509, West Haven, CT 06516 (Stock No. 3114-8-10; $10.95). |
| PUB TYPE | Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Academic Achievement; *Administrator Role; Educational Environment; Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Inservice Education; Instructional Improvement; *Instructional Leadership; Interschool Communication; Management Development; Needs Assessment; *Principals; *School Effectiveness; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Evaluation |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Effective Schools Research |

ABSTRACT

This paper presents summaries of selected articles and research reports that address the role of the principal in areas of instructional leadership, teacher evaluation, and student achievement. Research concludes that the single most important factor in determining the success of a school is the ability of the principal to coordinate, organize, and support the staff in planning, implementing, and evaluating improvements in the school's instructional program. Findings from research on the principal as an evaluator of teachers indicate the importance of school administrators to (1) set clearly defined instructional goals, (2) effectively communicate these goals to teachers, (3) build consensus among diverse understandings of the evaluation process, and (4) use evaluation results to strengthen professional growth. Research also suggests that it is the principal who has the greatest influence in establishing the school climate that will produce student success. A review of research studies highlights the need for improvements in the academic preparation and inservice training of principals. Appended are 10 general references and a 22-item bibliography on the role of the principal. (IW)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

National Education Association

RESEARCH

ED274083

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Felton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

# •What Research Says About:

# THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL IN EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

## Number 4

EA 018 847

*Professional and Organizational Development/Research Division*

# Foreword

Studies of the factors that contribute to the making of an effective school conclude that the leadership of the principal is a significant influence. Teachers, other educational personnel, and students need the instructional leadership, support, and assistance of the principal in order to fully carry out their respective responsibilities in the most productive ways. In this respect, the principal encourages leadership among teachers, respects the role of teachers, encourages critical and meaningful involvement of staff in important decisions, and organizes available resources that will provide maximum support to instruction. Therefore, the leadership role of the principal in an effective school has become an important consideration in efforts to restructure the public schools during this period of reform. This paper presents summaries of selected research that address the leadership role of the principal in the critical areas of instructional leadership, teacher evaluation, and student achievement. Findings concerning the preparation and in-service training programs that can enhance the leadership behavior of practicing school administrators are also summarized.

It is hoped that a brief summary of these research studies will provide leaders, staff, and members with data that can more accurately describe the leadership roles that principals should play in effective schools and the training that can enhance these desired behaviors. Using these data, specific recommendations for improving leadership and management can be made and supported. Improved leadership and management are critical to the conditions of work that are required for effective teaching and learning to occur.

*June 1986*

# THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL IN EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

## Number 4

# TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| THE PRINCIPAL AS INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER | 1 |
| THE PRINCIPAL AS EVALUATOR OF TEACHERS | 5 |
| PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT | 7 |
| THE PREPARATION AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF PRINCIPALS | 10 |
| SUMMARY | 13 |
| References | 13 |
| Bibliography on the Role of the Principal | 13 |

# THE PRINCIPAL AS INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

Instructional leadership is an integral component of the role of principals. It is the presumed work of the principalship. NEA has been in the vanguard of assessing the role and responsibilities of principals since 1928. Beginning with a survey of the principalship, the Research Division, in collaboration with the NEA Department of Elementary School Principals, stressed the importance of the principal's role in the area of supervision.

There are many perspectives from which to view the role and responsibilities of an effective principal as instructional leader. For example, Mortimer Adler, in *The Paideia Proposal*, recommends that the principal be viewed as the head teacher. John Goodlad, in *A Place Called School*, however, opposes this view contending that the principal has too much to do to act as an instructional leader. Researchers in several studies recommend that instructional leadership be delegated to the assistant principal, instructional supervisors, or designated teachers in order to free the time of the principal for managerial duties, student discipline, etc. This may be a truncated point of view inasmuch as leadership can also be viewed as a skill that can be exercised by any person with expertise in this area. The new and complex issues and responsibilities emerging from education-centered legislation suggest that the principal of the future will structure support necessary to utilize and encourage leadership by school staff and parents in developing and executing the instructional program.

The summary of findings of studies cited below indicate that the single most important factor in determining the success of a school is the ability of the principal to coordinate, organize and support the staff in planning, implementing, and evaluating improvements in the school's instructional program. Contemporary researchers are also of the opinion that the focus of future research must be to clearly articulate the specific behaviors encompassed by the broader principal functions in order to make the instructional leadership concept more definitive.

**Deal, Terrence E. and Lynn D. Celotti, "How Much Influence Do (and Can) Educational Administrators Have on Classrooms?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61 (March 1980), pp. 471-473.**

The purpose of this study was to assess the relationship between classroom instruction (individualized and team teaching) and organizational or administrative factors. Data were obtained from interviews and questionnaires to compare perceptions of administrators and teachers from 1973 with those of 1975 to determine how district and school organization—roles, policies, and administrative practices—did or did not affect classroom organization and instruction over time. A sample of 103 elementary schools were selected randomly within 34 school districts in the San Francisco Bay area to participate in this 3-year study. The districts ranged in size, wealth, and location, and the schools varied in size with teaching staff from 4 to 30.

Some of the significant findings of the study are as follows:

- The classroom was depicted as a relatively autonomous unit with its instructional or organizational characteristics reflecting no formal influence by the community, district office, principal or even the teacher next door.
- There was a lack of linkage between and within each level of the educational organization: in schools, individual professionals seemed to operate independently of one another.
- Lack of consensus supported the view that patterns of organization in schools and districts are more disconnected than previously thought. (About most issues, superintendents did not agree with principals, nor did principals agree with teachers.)
- Agreement was particularly low in the area of instructional approaches and practices.

In conclusion, it was the belief of the authors that by assuming the role of "colleagues" or "symbolic leaders" who offer advice and support to teachers, principals may be able to have a more positive effect on classroom instruction far greater than leaders operating through inadequate formal channels.

**Newberg, Norman A. and Allan A. Glatthorn, "Instructional Leadership: Four Ethnographic Studies on Junior High School Principals." (Executive Summary) Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1982. [ED 236 809]**

This study of instructional leadership styles of principals of four unusually successful inner city schools was conducted in a large urban school district located on the east coast of the United States. The criteria used in selecting the schools was a combination of expert opinion regarding the school, its principal and staff, and indications of improvement of student standardized test scores. The sources of data included interviews, observations, school records, principal's logs, and two faculty surveys.

The findings of this study revealed that while scores on achievement tests were improving, though not always dramatically, in none of the schools was the principal perceived to be providing instructional leadership. Certain key vice-principals and department chairs were influential in providing this function while the principals used their time mainly in performing management functions and handling discipline. This study "seemed to give tentative support to other research which suggests that in the secondary school, instructional leadership is more diffuse and complex than it is in the elementary school."

Newberg and Glatthorn recommended that the function of instructional leadership be distinguished by two levels—general and specific. Administrators can be effective as generalists in providing vision, direction, and coordination. Specifically, administrators should assign leadership responsibilities to competent staff and provide the necessary time to enable them to function effectively.

**Rutherford, William, L., "School Principals as Effective Leaders." *Phi Delta Kappan* September 1985, pp. 31-34.**

A team of researchers at the University of Texas at Austin conducted a 5-year study of the leadership skills of elementary and secondary principals. Data were obtained from observations of and interviews with the principals, interviews with teachers who worked under them, and interviews with key central office staff members in their school districts. Data that emerged from this study were consistent with earlier research that identified the following essential qualities of effective as distinguished from less effective building principals as instructional leaders:

Effective Principals as Instructional Leaders:

- Have clear, informed visions of what they want their schools to become—visions that focus on students and their needs.
- Translate these visions into goals for their schools and expectations for their teachers, students, and administrators. (Teachers working under less-effective principals seemed to function more as individuals than as members of a team.)
- Establish school climates that support progress toward these goals and expectations. (Effective principals allocate funding and materials in ways that maximize teaching effectiveness, and also reward teachers for attaining those goals.)
- Continuously monitor progress. (The more-effective principals provided not only specific details about the performance of their teachers but also insights into why the teachers performed as they did.)
- Intervene in a supportive or corrective manner, when this seems necessary. (Effective principals looked for positive features and then directly and sincerely recognized and praised the teachers responsible for them. When a problem involved the performance of a teacher, they tried to provide the kinds of support and assistance that would yield improvement.)

**Hallinger, Philip and Joseph Murphy, "Assessing the Instructional Management Behavior of Principals." *The Elementary School Journal*, November 1985, pp. 217-247.**

This study was an initial attempt to develop a research-based definition of the principal's role as instructional manager (used synonymously with instructional leader). The authors examined the

instructional behavior of 10 elementary school principals in a suburban school district near San Jose, California that serves approximately 8,000 students, from diverse ethnic backgrounds, in grades K-12. Data were obtained from a 71-item questionnaire designed to assess principal instructional management behavior supplemented by data culled from several documents that included supervisory assessments, teacher evaluation reports, school goal statement, principal newsletters, memos and bulletins, school handbooks, faculty meeting agendas and minutes, etc. An extensive review of research on the conceptual definitions of job functions of the principal generated data for the variables examined in this study. The following three dimensions of instructional management were identified and then subdivided into specific job functions: (1) defines the school mission, (2) manages the instructional program, and (3) promotes a positive school learning climate.

Based upon the discrepancy between the findings of this study and previous research studies, the authors cite the following recommendations for future research on instructional management (leadership):

1. Research that examines the effects of different instructional management styles is needed . . . Studies that investigate the relationship between instructional management behavior and the following variables are needed most: student achievement, teacher behavior, and school climate.
2. Studies of instructional management should incorporate qualitative methodologies to generate richer descriptive reports about how principals manage curriculum and instruction.
3. The finding that highly ranked instructional managers in this district maintain close connections to students warrants further study to determine how this characteristic transfers to other areas of the principal's role.
4. The relationship between the levels of the organization and their effects on instructional management should be examined.
5. More systematic investigation concerning the relationship between gender and principal instructional management is needed.
6. Better indicators of principal knowledge of curriculum and instruction need to be developed.
7. The organizational factor most in need of explication in terms of its effects on instructional management is school size.
8. Researchers must remain aware of the interactive nature of individual and organizational factors in terms of their effect on principal instructional management.

This article includes a list of 98 references on instructional management and an appraisal instrument for measuring principal instructional management behavior.

**Bossert, Steven T., et al., "The Instructional Management Role of the Principal." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 18, No. 3 (Summer 1982), pp. 34-64.**

The authors examine the research on instructional organization and develop a theoretical model for examining instructional management which depicts the relationship between leadership and organization. The primary goal of this model is to describe how the organizational milieu of the school affects the schooling process. The model proposes that a principal can exhibit instructional management behaviors that affect school and classroom organization which in turn are believed to affect student outcomes. The variables used in this model are: (1) factors shaping principal behaviors; (2) specific principal management behaviors; (3) the two features of the school's social organization—instructional organization and climate; and (4) student outcomes. It is suggested that once these relationships are clearly delineated, the principal behaviors currently described in the research literature will provide more practical advice to principals regarding instructional management.

This review of related literature and research demonstrates that an understanding of the instruc-

tional management role of the principal is exceedingly complex. Some of the specific dimensions are to:

- Provide coherence to their schools' instructional programs
- Work with teachers to conceptualize instructional goals
- Set high academic standards
- Stay informed of policies and teachers' problems
- Make frequent classroom visits
- Create incentives for learning
- Create a climate that is conducive to stud learning.

In light of the current emphasis on performance evaluation and fiscal accountability, evaluation for the purpose of providing constructive feedback to instructional staff, school authorities, and the public has taken on increased significance. This impetus has increased awareness of the importance of evaluation as a critical skill of principals. Most school administrators agree that evaluating teacher performance is the most important function of principals. They also agree that improvements in performance evaluation are long overdo.

This summary of findings from recent research literature indicates the importance of school administrators to (1) set clearly defined instructional goals and objectives, (2) effectively communicate these goals to teachers, (3) build consensus among diverse understandings of the evaluation process, and (4) use the results of the evaluation process as feedback to strengthen professional growth.

**Thompson, June E., et al., *Failures of Communication in the Evaluation of Teachers by Principals*. Technical Report No. 43. Stanford University (California) Center for Research and Development in Teaching, April 1975. [ED 105 637]**

This review summarizes the findings of part of a larger study by the researcher that focuses on the way in which evaluation of teachers by principals is hampered by difficulties in communication. Data were obtained from a questionnaire administered to 33 principals in three districts and 131 teachers in one district. To allow for possible error by the disparity of sample selection of teachers, a later study was made of a small sample of teachers in the two additional districts. The results of the larger sample revealed that:

- Evaluation by principals tended to be too infrequent to provide helpful guidance to teachers.
- Half of the teachers did not know the criteria they were being evaluated on or the information used to evaluate them.
- Nearly all the principals believed that teachers knew more about criteria used and the information collected than teachers reported knowing.
- Principals thought they were communicating more evaluations, positive or negative, than teachers reported receiving.
- Increased frequency of evaluation by principals would not threaten the professional autonomy of teachers.
- The lower the frequency of communicated evaluations reported by teachers, the more dissatisfied were the teachers and the less helpful were the evaluations in improving the quality of their teaching.

**Rothberg, Robert A. and Lila L. Buchanan, "Teacher Perceptions of Teacher Assessment." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62 (March 1981), p. 527.**

A survey was administered to 205 elementary and secondary educators attending graduate classes or in-service programs at the University of Central Florida in Orlando. The purpose of the study was to evaluate teacher perceptions of assessment procedures used by administrators. The majority (90%) of the respondents were classroom teachers with an average of 5.9 years of teaching experience. The remainder were counselors, media or speech specialists. This study concluded that in order to make assessment procedures more likely to improve instruction, classroom observations and follow-up conferences should be more frequent and lengthy but less threatening. The specific findings are as follows:

- Forty-six percent of respondents perceived the post-observation teacher/administrator conference most likely to lead to instructional improvement.
- Only 49 percent felt that their personal conference experiences had actually helped them improve their teaching, while 45 percent responded they had derived no benefit.
- Nearly one-third (31%) perceived classroom observation as the most helpful feature of the evaluation process.

- Most frequently mentioned "worst feature" of the assessment procedure was teacher stress (16%), followed by infrequency and brevity of observations (15%).
- Forty-two percent of respondents believed that more frequent, longer, more informal, and less threatening classroom observations would likely improve instruction.
- Fifteen percent of respondents believed that follow-up conferences seemed the best place to improve assessment procedures.
- Fifty-five percent believed that currently practiced assessment procedures "somewhat" improve instruction, and 37 percent responded "very little".
- Twenty-one percent of the respondents suggested the following options for administrators to consider: (1) use evaluators other than or in addition to the building principal, i.e., subject-matter consultants, departmental supervisors, fellow teachers, parents; and (2) in-service training for teachers in techniques of self-evaluation.

**Sapone, Carmelo V., "Appraisal and Evaluation Systems: Perceptions of Administrators, Teachers." *NASSP Bulletin*, February 1981, pp. 25-30.**

With the current emphasis on performance evaluation, the author recognized that few local systems have attempted to develop comprehensive appraisal and evaluation systems in their districts. In this study, Sapone designed a questionnaire comprising a list of 18 components found in some form in most evaluation models to determine if each component should *ideally* be included in an appraisal and evaluation system. The respondents were also asked to indicate (rank) whether each component was *realistic* in terms of actual implementation in their school district. The questionnaire was administered to teachers and 70 administrators (mostly principals and assistant principals) in western New York and Ontario, Canada. The findings of this study indicated that:

- There is a wide difference in how administrators and teachers rank the importance of each component, ideally and realistically.
- Administrators do not rank the goal-setting process as one of their very high priorities, ideally (12th) and realistically (5th). Teachers, however, rank this process as their first priority, both ideally and realistically.
- Principals, in particular, need extensive inservice training on the effective use of comprehensive appraisal and evaluation models.
- Even though it may be desirable (ideally), administrators and teachers agree perceptually that a realistic appraisal and evaluation model would be difficult, if not impossible, to implement.

**Seifert, Edward H. and John J. Beck, "Elementary Principals: Instructional Leaders or School Managers?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62 (March 1981), p. 528.**

One aspect of a survey conducted in the Texas public schools of 82 elementary school administrators and 146 teachers teaching under these principals noted the differences between teachers and principals regarding the perceived purpose of teacher evaluation in the area of instruction. Findings of the study revealed that:

- A majority (62%) of the principals in the study believed that instructional improvement is the real purpose of evaluation, but only one-fifth (20.6%) of the teachers were in concurrence.
- Most of the teachers (60.3%) believed renewal or cancellation of contracts as the real purpose of evaluation, while 34.5 percent of the principals cited this reason.
- Nearly 73 percent of the principals believed they can help teachers improve their teaching through evaluation procedures with female principals significantly more likely than males to believe this.
- Females are more likely than male administrators to believe that teachers should participate in developing their own evaluation plans.
- Principals with less experience are significantly more likely to see the need for a pre-observation conference. Principals in smaller schools (fewer than 30 teachers) are also more inclined to favor such conferences.

Conclusions based on the research reports in the late 1960's and early 70's that attempted to show that schools had little if any effect on the variance in achievement levels of students have been disproved. Subsequent research studies analyzed the variables used in these studies and found that the conclusions based on this kind of research were erroneous. Current research shows that what takes place in the schools can make an important difference both in students' academic achievement and in their personal development. A number of more recent effective schooling studies provide evidence concerning which leadership functions of the principal are most critical to achieving success in the area of student academic achievement. The emphasis in these later studies is the magnitude and quality of the building principal's leadership. It was found that it is the principal who has the greatest influence in establishing the school climate (environment) that will produce student success. This climate arises from the principal's commitment to the high expectations for student success that are communicated to both teachers and students and permeate the entire school. This commitment to high expectations inextricably involves both teachers and students.

Data in the studies cited below are based on observations in schools (exemplary and/or successful) where students are performing at higher levels than would be predicted from student performance in comparable schools.

**Cohen, Michael, "Effective Schools: What the Research Says." *Today's Education*, April-May, 1981, pp. 58-61.**

In assessing the findings of the most recent effective schools research studies, the author concluded that nearly all of these studies used average scores on standardized tests of basic skills as the criteria of effectiveness in the elementary schools. He concurs with the findings of Ronald Edmonds of the Harvard University Graduate School of Education, that differences in effectiveness among schools can be accounted for by the following factors:

- *Strong administrative leadership* by the school principal, especially in regard to instructional matters.
- *A school climate* conducive to learning; that is a safe and orderly school relatively free of discipline and vandalism problems.
- *Schoolwide emphasis on basic skills instruction* which entails acceptance among the professional staff that instruction in the basic skills is the primary goal of the schools.
- *Teacher expectations* that all students, regardless of family background, can reach appropriate levels of achievement.
- *A system for monitoring and assessing pupil performance* which is tied to instructional objectives.

These factors imply that in an effective school, agreements on instructional goals, high achievement expectations, and strong leadership from the principal are widely shared among the school staff.

**Brookover, W. B. et al., *School Social Systems and Student Achievement—Schools Can Make A Difference*. Brooklyn, New York: Praeger Publishers, 1979.**

The authors' earlier investigations (1975 and 1979) indicated that there were distinguishable differences in leadership in effective and ineffective schools. On the basis of the previous research, this study was designed to examine the hypothesis that differences in school social systems explain differences in student outcomes among schools. An analyses of data collected from three groups of Michigan elementary schools—a representative state sample (68), a majority black school sample (30), and a majority white school sample (61)—determined the use of case studies in four low SES schools. The analyses suggested that the following components of the school social system defined the predominant variance in achievement between schools: (1) school inputs, (2) school social structures, and (3) school climate.

This investigation of school climate and student achievement found significant exceptions of students

of low socioeconomic status achieving at higher levels than is typical for schools with such student populations. Achievement in these low SES schools was attributable to the differences in leadership. Leadership differences in the schools resulted in the conclusion that "... lack of pressure relative to teacher performance and little emphasis on increased achievement appeared to differentiate low achieving schools from those more effective." Some of the findings related to leadership in the successful schools are as follows:

- Supervision in the successful schools was decidedly different from that in unsuccessful schools, for example, frequent classroom visitations, conferences with teachers concerning student achievement, etc.
- The principal's concern for achievement and high expectations was communicated to both students and teachers.
- The principal exhibited a commitment to and assumed responsibility for ensuring that students could and should be achieving at relatively high levels.

This study suggests that the principal's effective leadership facilitates a school climate that supports student achievement.

**Weber, George, "Inner-City Children Can Be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools." Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education, 1971.**

Weber was a pioneer in testing the hypothesis that *schools* can make a difference in the academic success of students. The questions raised, methodology used, and results obtained make this study exceptional. Weber states that the success in the four inner-city schools identified for this study shows "that the failure in beginning reading typical of inner-city schools is the fault not of the children or their background—but of the schools."

To find schools for this study, Weber solicited nominations from reading specialists, school officials, and publishers over a period of a year. After visitations, validity checks, and testing had been completed, four schools were selected from the 95 nominations received. Two of these schools were located in Manhattan, one in Kansas City, and one in Los Angeles. These urban schools had a significant number of poor students and each had reading achievement medians in the third grade that equaled or exceeded national reading norms. The results of a test to determine reading ability showed that reading ability in the four schools was similar to that of students in average-income schools.

An in-depth study of reading instruction in these successful urban schools revealed that there was a decided emphasis on reading with strong direction from the principal in three of the schools and the beginning reading program led by the area superintendent in the fourth school. The case studies reported in this investigation showed that each of these schools exhibited the following factors: (1) strong instructional leadership, (2) high expectations, (3) orderly climate, and (4) stress on reading, particularly in the primary grades.

**State of New York, Office of Educational Performance Review. "School Factors Influencing Reading Achievement: A Case Study of Two Inner City Schools." March 1974.**

Two inner-city New York City public schools, with an analogous predominantly poor pupil population, were selected for this study to identify those differences that seemed most responsible for the reading achievement variation between the two schools. It was found that the primary contributing factor of the higher achieving school was the quality of principal leadership which resulted in an orderly and efficient school climate with high level of cooperation from staff, students, and parents. Some of the specific findings reported were:

- Administrative behavior, policies, and practices in the school appeared to have a significant impact on school effectiveness.
- The more effective inner-city school was led by an administrative team that provided a good bal-

ance between both management and instructional skills.

- The administrative team in the more effective school had developed a plan for dealing with the reading problem and had implemented the plan throughout the school.

It was concluded that the findings in this study reinforce the relevance of pupil performance to the institutional elements of leadership, expectations, and atmosphere.

**Clark, David L. et al., "Factors Associated with Success in Urban Elementary Schools." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61 (March 1980), pp. 467-470.**

Studies of urban schools that have been the exceptions to the predicted negative achievement in most urban elementary schools stimulated the authors to examine the factors associated with this success. This study of "maverick" or "outlier" schools was sponsored by Phi Delta Kappa and funded by the Lilly Endowment. An inventory of more than 1,200 studies of urban schools found 97 (59 case studies and 38 research studies) that were pertinent to include in the final study sample. In addition, the authors interviewed leading researchers and writers on urban education to solicit their views on the factors associated with success in urban elementary schools. Based upon this aggregated data, the researchers focused on six variables generally thought to influence school performance: leadership (behavior and attitude), teaching personnel, finance, resources and facilities, curriculum and instruction, and community resources. Data concerning the leadership factor support the following generalizations:

- The behavior of the designated school or program leader is crucial in determining school success.
- Effective leaders *did* more; they framed goals and objectives, set standards of performance, created a productive working environment, and obtained needed support.
- The leader's attitude toward urban education and expectations for school or program success determines the impact of the leader on exceptional schools.
- Schools can be improved if available energies and resources are focused specifically on the central problem facing urban schools, i.e., improving student achievement in basic skills.
- Sixty-three percent of the cases reported the use of supplemental staff (reduction in adult/pupil ratio) in achieving positive school performance.

# THE PREPARATION AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF PRINCIPALS

Studies conducted over the last decade in the effective schools reform literature found that one of the "critical variables" that distinguish good schools from poor schools was "strong administrative leadership." A review of the changes currently underway in many states in the selection, duties, and evaluation of school administrators indicates that building principals will have to be retrained to carry out their new functions. In this regard, the 1984 Education Commission of the States task force, *Action in the States*, reports that in the past three years 43 states have initiated programs for developing the leadership and managerial skills of school administrators. These programs cover a wide range of topics, from effective management techniques to training for staff evaluation. States are also implementing higher standards for the recruitment, certification, and evaluation of principals. Businesses are also providing additional opportunities for administrators to learn more about effective management techniques.

To acquire the skills that are currently demanded of school administrators, Gordon Cawelti, Executive Director of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, states that "... improved university preparation programs and more effective human resource development for practicing administrators are more important than ever. We must now think through what the curriculum for school administrators should be and what pedagogy (or andragogy) will best assist administrators to better cope if not lead." He recommends that development programs for educational leaders should include study of management functions, leadership behavior, and instructional leadership skills.

The following summary of the review of research studies highlights the need for improvements in the academic preparation and in-service training of principals that will enable them to function more effectively as administrators in today's schools:

**Gorton, Richard A. and Kenneth E. McIntyre. *The Senior High School Principalship, Vol. II: The Effective Principal.* Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1978.**

The findings of a national study that included a sample of 60 senior high school principals was conducted by the National Association of Secondary Principals in 1977. The purpose of the study was to ascertain the personal characteristics, professional qualities and competencies, and situational conditions which seem to be associated with effective, exemplary senior high school principals. Data from the study resulted in the following recommendations that relate to the preparation and in-service training of principals:

- Training in program evaluation, curriculum development, school/community communications, teacher inservice education, and time management need greater attention in the pre- and in-service programs of administrators.
- More attention needs to be given in the university preparation program to the development of human relations skills and personality characteristics.
- Universities and principals' organizations should seek better ways to combine their resources in order to make pre-service more effective.
- More thought should be given to problems pertaining to teacher performance in the planning of pre-service and in-service education for principals.

**Greenfield, William D., Jr., "Research on Public School Principals: A Review and Recommendations." Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1982.**

The last section of this extensive review of major published empirical research focuses on the implications of the research on the training and selection of principals. Greenfield states that "research results on the formal training or preparation of school principals are meager." However, this review of research findings reveals that:

- No unequivocal confirmation that factors such as age, race, sex, experience, and formal training are predictive of effectiveness as a principal.

- The number of years of teaching or prior administrative experience of principals is not a useful predictor of success.
- There may be a negative relationship between perceived effectiveness and number of credits of graduate study.
- Graduate preparation programs for principals could be more effective were they to reflect the results of research in their training efforts.

**Brightman, Harvey J., "Improving Principals' Performance Through Training in the Decision Sciences." *Educational Leadership* (February 1984), pp. 50-56.**

This research study demonstrates the importance of training programs for principals in the field of Decision Sciences. From a survey of 39 principals and assistant principals in over 20 schools in a suburban school district, Brightman concluded that the majority of the principals studied could be classified as "entrepreneurs" and "disturbance handlers." These two terms were borrowed from Mintzberg's list of 10 decisional and nondecisional managerial roles that were used in this study to classify principals' behavior on the job. As *entrepreneur*, the principal focuses effort in planning, designing, and implementing curricular or administrative "improvement projects" for the school versus the *disturbance handler* who focuses on fighting forest fires.

The decision styles of administrators in this study were classified as *sensing* (sensing/thinking and sensing/feeling) and *intuitive* (intuitive/thinking and intuitive/feeling). The data indicated that school administrators tended to be mostly *sensing managers*. Since only four of the participants were classified as the N-type (intuitive), they were eliminated from the analysis. The findings indicated that the sensing/thinking (but not sensing/feeling) school administrators who allocate more time for the decisional roles were rated as more effective. Also, both ST (sensing/thinking) and SF (sensing/feeling) administrators who allocate more time to the entrepreneurial subrole were rated as more effective.

This study suggests the need for inservice training programs to focus on improving the ability of school administrators to perform the unique entrepreneurial and disturbance handler subroles.

**Page, Jane A. and Fred M. Page, Jr., "Principals' Perceptions of Their Role and the Perceived Effectiveness of Their Academic Preparation for that Role." Statesboro, Georgia: Georgia Southern College, April 24, 1984. [ED 242 710]**

This research effort resulted from a perceived need to study school administrators in the Georgia public schools to determine (1) perceptions of areas of difficulty related to their occupational responsibilities; and (2) perceptions of their academic preparation to function in their current positions.

Data for this study were obtained from the return of 312 useable instruments mailed to an original randomly selected sample of 500 Georgia school principals. A majority (71.2%) of the principals surveyed had more than 15 years in the field of education; 19.2 percent had more than 15 years in the principalship; over half (58.7%) had obtained a specialist or doctorate degree; and the majority were white (79.8%) and male (61.2%). The principals rated the quality of preparation they received in their graduate programs and the level of difficulty they encountered related to 20 role variables. Some of the significant findings are as follows:

- Respondents perceived their preparation as adequate in many areas. The areas receiving high ratings included preparation in (1) school plant, (2) observation of instruction, (3) compliance with governmental guidelines, (4) evaluation of self, and (5) evaluation of teachers.
- Areas of preparation receiving very low ratings included (1) lunch program, (2) pupil transportation, (3) leadership of nonteaching staff, (4) purchasing, (5) extra-curricula student activities, (6) school board relations, and (7) parental relations.
- The majority of the principals identified little or very little difficulty encountered with all of the 20

role variables. The areas perceived as least difficult included: (1) central office administration relations, (2) school board relations, (3) school office management, (4) extra-curricula student activities, (5) leadership of nonteaching staff, and (6) community relations.

- At least one-third of the principals rated the following variables as being somewhat difficult, very difficult or extremely difficult: (1) faculty development, (2) evaluation of teachers, (3) student behavior, and (4) evaluation of self. Curriculum planning was also rated as difficult by many of the respondents.
- High quality preparation was positively related (18 of the 20 variables) to little difficulty.
- Principals with doctorate degrees were significantly more likely to perceive a higher level of preparation in evaluation of teachers and evaluation of self.
- Blacks perceived a higher level of preparation on 16 of 20 roles than did whites.
- Females perceived better preparation in curriculum planning and faculty development.
- Males perceived better preparation in school office management and purchasing.

The findings imply that preparation should be especially improved in the areas of faculty development and student behavior.

This report has summarized selected research studies that relate to the role of the building principal in the areas of instructional leadership, evaluation of teachers, and student achievement. Research studies related to the preparation and inservice training of principals were also included. The findings in these studies seem to indicate that the effectiveness of the school rests with the principal's ability to influence and coordinate the learning environment and resources that will facilitate and support necessary teacher growth that contributes to student success.

The current reform movement continues to call for changes in the preparation and performance of those responsible for the education of our youth. To put this statement in context, Lucianne Carmichael at the Harvard Principals' Center states that "principals need to value and work toward change in themselves before they expect change in teachers."

## References


Adler, Mortimer J. *The Paideia Proposal*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1982.

Carmichael, Lucianne, "Leaders as Learners: A Possible Dream." *Educational Leadership*, October 1982, pp. 58-59.

Cawelti, Gordon, "Training for Effective School Administrators." *Educational Leadership* 39 (February 1982), pp. 324-329.

Goodlad, John I. *A Place Called School*. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1983.

Kroeze, David J., "Effective Principals as Instructional Leaders: New Directions for Research." *Administrator's Notebook* 30, No. 9, 1984.

Report by the Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, Education Commission of the States, *Action in the States*, July 1984.

Shoemaker, Joan and Hugh W. Fraser, "What Principals Can Do: Some Implications from Studies of Effective Schooling." *Phi Delta Kappan*, November 1981, pp. 178-182.

Sweeney, James, "Research Synthesis on Effective School Leadership." *Educational Leadership*, February 1982, pp. 346-352.

The Best of ERIC, "Preparation of Principals." Eugene, Oregon: College of Education, University of Oregon, April 1985.

*The Effective Principal. The Best of ERIC on Educational Management*, No. 64. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, February 1982. [ED 213 069]


## Bibliography on the Role of the Principal


Blumberg, A. and W. Greenfield. *The Effective Principal: Perspectives in School Leadership*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1980.

Bossert, Steven T. *Principal Leadership: Four "think pieces."* Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, August 31, 1981.

Cotton, Kathleen and W. G. Savard, "The Principal as Instructional Leader." Portland, Oregon: Audit and Evaluation Program, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1980 (Mimeographed)

Leithwood, K. A. and D. J. Montgomery, "The Role of the Elementary School Principal in Program Improvement." *Review of Educational Research* 52, No. 3 (Fall 1982), pp. 309-339.

Lipham, James A. *Effective Principal, Effective School*. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1981.

McCleary, Lloyd E. and Scott D. Thomson. *The Senior High School Principalship* Vol. III. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979.

Mangieri, John N. and John W. Arnn, Jr., "Excellent Schools: The Leadership Functions of Principals." *American Education*, Vol. 21, No. 3, 1985.

Mulhauser, F. "Recent Research on the Principalship: A View from NIE" (summary paper). Washington, D.C." National Institute of Education, February 1983.

Murphy, Joseph, et al., "Problems with Research on Educational Leadership: Issues to be Addressed." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 5 (Fall 1983). pp. 297-305.

National Association of Secondary School Principals, *The Effective Principal: A Research Summary*. Reston, Virginia: NASSP, 1982.

Neagley, Ross L. and N. Dean Evans. *Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruction* (3rd Edition). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980.

*Performance-Based Preparation of Principals: A Framework for Improvement*. Special Report. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1985.

Pitner, Nancy J. "Training of the School Administrator: State of the Art." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, February 1982 (Mimeographed)

"Schools—and Their Principals—Do Make A Difference" *Research Action Brief No. 20*. Washington, D.C.: The National Institute of Education, December 1981.

Silver, P. F. and D. W. Spuck, *Preparatory Programs for Educational Administrators in the United States*. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1978.

Stogdill, R. M. *Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research*. New York: Free Press, 1974.

*The Role of Elementary School Principals: A Summary of Research*. ERS Research Brief. Arlington, Virginia: Educational Research Service, 1982.

"The Role of the Principal as Instructional Leader." *Theory Into Practice*, Vol. 18, No. 1, February 1979.

Valentine, J. et al., *The Mid-Level Principalship, Vol. I*. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1981.

Weisenstein, Greg R., "Teacher Evaluation: The Principal's Role." *OSSC Bulletin* 20 (1976), pp. 3-23.

Wellisch, Jean B., et al., "School Management and Organization in Successful Schools." *Sociology of Education* 51 (1978), pp. 211-226.

Wilson, A. P. *The Principalship: A Selected Bibliography*. Center for the Study of Educational Policy and Administration. The University of Utah, 1980.

Sale Copies: NEA members Stock No. 3114-8-00, $5.00
Nonmembers Stock No. 3114-8-10, $10.95

Additional copies may be ordered from the NEA Professional Library, P.O. Box 509, West Haven, CT 06516.

*Reproduction:* No part of this report may be reproduced in any form without written permission from NEA Research, except by NEA-affiliated associations. Any reproduction of the report materials must include the usual credit line. Address communications to Editor, NEA Research.

National Education Association
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036